

the bill before us, my chief reason is not to speak in the interests of such citizens merely, but to speak in our own interest, in the interests of Canada. When we permit discrimination against one section of our citizenry we are doing harm to ourselves, far more harm than we are doing to the group against which we discriminate. And so it is because of the good name of Canada, because of the freedom for which this country stands, at least theoretically and, I am glad to say, stands for in most things really; it is because we want to guard against any infringement of our own accepted principles of freedom that I am going to insist, as far as I can, on the complete removal of discrimination against any class of Canadian citizens.

The legislation proposed is a partial remedy for a long standing wrong. I need not go into details in that regard, because hon. members of the house know exactly to which things I refer. One of those discriminations still stands; that is, that residents of Canada of Chinese origin, unless they are Canadian citizens, still cannot bring in their relatives, their children or their wives, whereas other immigrants coming from other parts of the world can do so. As far as I know that is the only discrimination now remaining against our Chinese immigrants; all the others are being removed. So the bill may be said to be a denial of the murder of the spirit of racial inequality, while closing the door on the skeleton which still may be used in evidence.

Mr. LOW: You will have to explain that one.

Mr. IRVINE: Well, we shall leave it for further consideration. I think when my hon. friend sees it in *Hansard* he will understand its meaning. As I say, this is the last vestige of inequality which stands, and I am urging the minister in charge of this legislation to give consideration to its removal. I suggest that he either extend to immigrants from China who are now in Canada the same privilege that is extended to all other immigrants, or else impose upon all others an equal restriction which would mean that immigrants from other countries, unless they are citizens of Canada, could not bring in their wives, children and relatives. That would put them on the same basis. We cannot afford to have two standards of dealing with either our immigrants or our citizens, and that is the point I want to emphasize. I want to make a plea for equality of treatment to all who are permitted to come within our gates.

I have already pointed out that I believe those who are defending the discrimination have no desire to inflict any hurt upon any

member of the yellow race; but they do so. Not only that, but they are inflicting greater harm upon Canada herself. I want to take issue particularly with the viewpoint expressed earlier in this debate by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), who happens not to be in his seat; I am sure I shall say nothing he would want to deny even if he were here. In his remarks the hon. member told us he wanted to keep his eye on the ball, which was the main immigration policy; then he promptly kicked the ball off the field entirely and was still looking for it in the bushes at the close of his remarks. But that is only in passing.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): It is probably locked up in the cupboard with your skeleton.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. member gave us an illustration which I want to quote and use in another sense. His illustration was this, that if he found his neighbours in need of economic assistance he would not invite them all to live at his house, but would give of his substance to the utmost of his ability to maintain his impecunious neighbours in their own homes rather than bring them into his own. I think that illustration may have some real point if he applies it to a general immigration policy. But let me apply a similar illustration to the actual situation with which this bill deals. Let me suppose that the hon. member for Lethbridge invited a number of his neighbours to have a meal with him, to enjoy his hospitality. When they arrived he picked out two or three and said, "You have to eat in the kitchen. You cannot come into the main dining room with the rest of us; you stay out here." Perhaps two or three of them would be sent down to the basement with their plates. I know the hon. gentleman would never think of doing that. He is far too courteous and too kind to do anything like that; but if he did he would be regarded as a snob, not only by those who were forced to sit in the kitchen but also by those who were allowed to sit at the table with the host himself. That is pretty much the situation. In this particular at least we do not allow these people to sit at the table with the host; we deny them that one little privilege. We put them in the kitchen and say, "You stay there; you cannot have all the privileges." Since this is such a small thing I hope the minister and the Prime Minister will reconsider it. Its effect upon the ultimate immigration policy would be very slight, but its effect upon the name of Canada may be very great. That is a matter which must be taken into considera-